

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY  
COUNTY OF NEW YORK  
ONE HOGAN PLACE  
New York, N. Y. 10013  
(212) 335-9000**

**OFFICER: RONALD CAPURSI  
TAX NUMBER: 941 497**

**DISCLOSURE ADVISORY**

For the person named above, whom the People may call as a witness, please be advised as follows.

1. The New York City Police Department (NYPD) has deemed substantiated an allegation that on April 26, 2016, RONALD CAPURSI failed to notify IAB and a Duty Captain or Operations. The NYPD found that when a fellow police officer was the victim of an unprovoked attack by another police officer. Ronald Capursi, and two other officers attempted to break up the fight. There were no injuries reported in the fight. However, Ronald Capursi, and six additional officers who were present at the scene, did not notify the New York City Police Department of the fight and did not remain on the scene as required in the Patrol Guide.
2. The New York City Police Department (NYPD) has deemed substantiated an allegation that on August 23, 2016, RONALD CAPURSI did not appear for a scheduled appearance at the Traffic Violations Bureau..
3. The New York City Police Department (NYPD) has deemed substantiated an allegation that on October 30, 2017, RONALD CAPURSI did not appear for a scheduled appearance at the Traffic Violations Bureau..
4. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) noted the following misconduct: that on March 23, 2014, RONALD CAPURSI failed to prepare a memobook entry when required to do so. On March 24, 2014, Ronald Capursi and his partner observed a motorist seated in a double parked car in a manner that was impeding the flow of traffic. Initially, they sounded the siren in an effort to get the motorist to move on. When the motorist did not comply, they tuned on the turret lights and approached the automobile. When the motorist continued in her refusal to move the car, Ronald Capursi's partner issued a summons to her for double parking. Because Ronald Capursi acknowledged his participation in the incident and that he had not prepared a memo book entry, CCRB cited him for other misconduct, failure to prepare a mem book entry when required to do so.
5. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) noted the following misconduct: On November 16, 2018, Ronald Capursi a) improperly used his bodyworn camera by failing to activate it when required to do so, and b) failed to prepare memo book entries when required to do so. During the early evening hours of November 16, 2018. Ronald Capursi and several other officers were summoned to an apartment to investigate the occupant's report that his apartment had been burglarized. The officers did not believe that there was evidence of a burglary and deemed the complaint unfounded. The apartment occupant demanded that the officers investigate his complaint. In the course of

their interaction, a determination was made that the occupant was an Emotionally Disturbed Person (EDP) and he was transported to a hospital. That hospitalization resulted in his involuntary commitment. Ronald Capursi did not activate his bodyworn camera at any time during the incident. The NYPD rules and regulations required that his camera be and remain activated for the duration of the incident. He also did not prepare memo-book entries when required to do so.

6. As of October 13, 2020, RONALD CAPURSI, is the subject of a pending complaint before the CCRB on June 4, 2020 for an incident on June 4, 2020 where it is alleged that he abused his authority by improperly questioning a civilian.

Various publicly available websites and databases contain disciplinary information for certain law enforcement officers. Information in such databases about this officer is not necessarily included in this advisory.

Any information herein regarding civil lawsuits against an officer is not necessarily a complete list of civil lawsuits in which that officer is a defendant.

Allegations of misconduct that have not been substantiated and are not pending (including, but not limited to, findings of unsubstantiated, unfounded, and exonerated), and allegations of technical infractions, are not subject to disclosure and are not included in this advisory.

The decision to include information in this advisory does not represent a conclusion by the People that it is required to be disclosed.

The People reserve the right to oppose or move to limit the use of any information included herein or disclosed in the future.

If you have any questions, please contact the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case on which you are receiving this advisory.

Date: October 17, 2020